



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/923,969	08/08/2001	Shell S. Simpson	10008204-1	2101

7590 02/22/2005  
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
----------

ANYA, CHARLES E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 02/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/923,969

Applicant(s)

SIMPSON ET AL.

Examiner

Charles E Anya

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/11/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-21 are pending this application.

***Claim Objections***

2. Claims 16 and 17 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 16 and 17 improperly depends on claim 13, the Examiner would change the dependency of claims 16 and 17 such that claims 16 and 17 would depend on claim 15 instead of claim 13.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the invention as claimed is not a machine, an article of manufacture, a composition or a process.

Applicant is required to amend independent claims 1 and 15 to reflect whether the claimed invention is a machine, an article of manufacture, a composition or a process.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1,15 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Specifically claims 1,15 and 21 include the limitation "redirector software at a website that is not a proxy server", and this claimed limitation is not supported in the specification.

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

**8. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

a. The following phrase lack antecedent basis:

i. "the destination reference" on line 13 of claim 1.

For the purpose of this office action the Examiner would change the phrase "the destination reference" to "the at least one destination reference".

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2126

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**10. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,623,527 B1 to Hamzy in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,870,546 to Kirsch.**

11. As to claim 1, Hamzy teaches a client configurable web based imaging page redirector system, comprising: client software at a client for receiving content from an imaging source at an external web site, wherein the content includes a designator to take a processing action with respect to at least a portion of the content (Client 101 Col. 4 Ln. 39 – 44, Ln. 54 – 59); redirector software at an external site that is not located at a proxy server to determine based on a rule at least one destination reference to a desired web page destination or web based imaging service to perform the processing action (Col. 4 Ln. 54 – 65, Col. 6 Ln. 20 – 25, Col. 9 Ln. 64 – 66) and the client software operating to receive the content to be processed and access the redirector reference and access the redirector software and obtain the destination reference (Col. 4 Ln. 54 – 65).

12. Hamzy is silent with reference to a storage mechanism accessible by the client software for storing a redirector reference to the redirector software.

13. Kirsch teaches a storage mechanism accessible by the client software for storing a redirector reference to the redirector software (Col. 6 Ln. 52 – 64, Col. 8 Ln. 25 – 28).

Art Unit: 2126

14. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kirsch and Hamzy because the teaching of Kirsch would improve the system of Hamzy by imposing minimum visibility of the redirection protocol on client users (Kirsch Col. 5 Ln. 46 – 50).

15. As to claim 2, Hamzy teaches the system as defined in claim 1, wherein the redirector reference is to a redirector web page that contains said redirector software (figure 3 Col. 5 Ln. 22 – 47).

16. As to claim 3, Hamzy teaches the system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the redirector reference is to a server that contains said redirector software (Proxy Server 103 Col. 4 Ln. 54 – 65).

17. As to claim 4, Hamzy teaches the system as defined in claim 1, wherein the client software is a printer driver (Col. 5 Ln. 8 – 21).

18. As to claim 5, Hamzy teaches the system as defined in claim 1, further comprising the element of a configuration page, displaying to the user a set of web page or web based imaging service options; receiving a selection of one of the options from the user; and storing a reference to the selected option as the destination reference (figure 2 Col. 4 Ln. 54 – 67).

Art Unit: 2126

19. As to claim 6, Hamzy teaches the system as defined in claim 1, wherein the redirector software includes code which looks for a cookie or other storage on a user's system that has a destination reference (figure 2 Col. 4 Ln. 54 – 65).

20. As to claim 7, Hamzy teaches the system as defined in claim 1, wherein the redirector software includes code that calls an API method for obtaining the destination reference (Col. 5 Ln. 8 – 21).

21. As to claim 8, Hamzy teaches the system as defined in claim 1, wherein the redirector software includes code to select a destination reference based on a plurality of rules (Col. 5 Ln. 49 – 67).

22.

23. As to claim 9, Hamzy teaches the system as defined in claim 8, wherein the rules include at least a first rule that provides a first destination reference if a user's system is inside of a firewall, and a second rule that provides a second destination reference if the user's system is outside of the firewall (Col. 5 Ln. 49 – 67).

24. As to claim 10, Hamzy teaches the system as defined in claim 1, wherein the redirector web page includes a hierarchy of destination references and further comprises code for automatically selecting the destination reference according to the hierarchy based on a rule of availability (Col. 7 Ln. 1 – 37).

Art Unit: 2126

25. As to claim 11, Hamzy teaches the system as defined in claim 1, wherein the redirector software selects a local service to access based on a location of a user's system, and accesses that service to determine the availability of a local image processor service (figure 4 Col. 7 Ln. 38 – 58).

26. As to claim 12, Hamzy teaches the system as defined in claim 11, wherein the redirector software selects a destination reference based on a first rule that if a local printer service is available, then selecting a destination reference for that local printer service, and a second rule that if no local printer service is available, then selecting a default destination reference (Col. 7 Ln. 1 – 32).

27. As to claim 13, Hamzy teaches the system as defined in claim 1, wherein the client software causes the user's browser to browse to a web site to obtain the redirector reference (figure 2 Col. 4 Ln. 33 – 67).

28. As to claim 14, Hamzy teaches the system as defined in claim 1, wherein the client software uploads the content to a personal imaging repository (Col. 6 Ln. 26 – 51).

29. As to claims 15 and 21, see the rejection of claim 1 above.

30. As to claims 16-19 and 20, see the rejection of claims 5-8 and 10 respectively.



***Response to Arguments***

31. Applicant's arguments filed 8/3/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

32. In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that (1) that the redirector software is not a proxy server; (2) the Hamzy prior art reference does not teach a user profile that is associated with a federated identify system such as "liberty alliance" or "MyServerices" and (3) the Hamzy prior art reference does not teach a chain a websites including a redirector website that a user can visit.

33. Examiner respectfully traverses Applicant's remarks:

As to point (1), the Hamzy prior art reference teaches the redirector software as a proxy server however this does not negate the fact that the proxy server's function is to determine at least one destination reference to a desired web page destination to perform a processing action. The proxy server performs this function by modifying a page to include inserting a push button and URL (destination reference) to a web server/print server (Col. 4 Ln. 54 – 65, Col. 5 Ln. 40 – 48, Col. 9 Ln. 64 – 66). By modifying the page the proxy server determines the URL/destination reference and the URL/destination reference describes a link or path to the web server/ print server.

As to point (2), the invention as claimed does not include this limitation and as such is not considered.

As to point (3), figure 2 of the Hamzy prior art reference describes a chain of more than one proxy server that serves as a redirector of a user/client software printing

request. This implies that a user/client software could request a printing job through more than one redirector software (proxy servers 103/111). However the invention as claimed does not include this limitation.

### ***Conclusion***

34. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,268,924 B1 to Koppolu et al: directed to a client application that interacts with a document object through a print application interface to control printing.

35. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E Anya whose telephone number is (571) 272-3757. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6:00) First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, An Meng-Ai can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Charles E Anya  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2126

cea.

  
MENG-AI T. AN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100